

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 14, 15, 19, 21 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

Claims 9, 19, 21 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed 4/28/2010, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

The claims have been amended as recommended in the Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,418,129 (Fingerhut) in view of U.S. Application Publication 2002/0062467 (Hunzinger), and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,139,014 (Kim). Further, claims 11, 14, 15, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fingerhut taken together with Hunzinger in view of U.S. Patent 6,920,479 (McDowall), and further in view of Kim.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In a section "Response to Arguments" provided in the last Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the features upon which the applicant relies (i.e., the connection request command

not including a request for connection with a specific base section) are not recited in the rejected claims. (Office Action at page 12). Applicant disagrees.

The recitation in independent claims 1 and 11 of “broadcasting a connection request command” connotes the feature of “the connection request command not including a request for connection with a specific base station.” Hence, it is clear that the feature of “the connection request command not including a request for connection with a specific base station” is implied by the claims even if independent claims 1 and 11 do not directly recite this feature “the connection request command not including a request for connection with a specific base station.”

Thus, Applicant remains of the position that the combination of references fails to teach the claimed connection counterpart notifying means for notifying a user of identification data of the base device to which the wireless terminal is currently connected.

The Examiner relies on Hunzinger and Kim for teaching features of the claimed connection counterpart notifying means. However, Applicant submits that neither reference teaches display of identification data of the base device. Hunzinger at paragraph 0018 merely discloses that the mobile device may not display or otherwise manifest the delivered content until the D-ACK is received. Applicant submits that “delivered content” does not constitute identification data of the connected base device and that display-acknowledgment D-ACK does not constitute identification data and is not disclosed as being displayed.

Applicant submits that Kim merely discloses that the portable phone controller 32 controls an OSD 40 of the interface unit 6 to display desired characters or a background image on the color LCD 48 of the display 8. Applicant submits that Kim does not make up for the deficiency in Fingerhut and Hunzinger of failing to disclose display of identification data of the base device to which the wireless terminal is connected.

Claim 11 recites, among other things, “connection establishing means...so as to establish a connection with a base device,” “connection completion notifying means” that broadcasts a connection process completion command that indicates that the connection with the connected base device is established, and “connection confirming means for obtaining...the connection confirmation command being for confirming the connection.” In the example embodiment disclosed in Fig. 10, the connection confirmation means of the TV main unit 3 obtains a connection confirmation command from wireless center 2b to which TV main unit is connected (S626...S617).

Alternatively, in the case where a predetermined time has elapsed without obtaining the connection confirmation command (YES at S618), the TV main unit 3 performs an OSD warning display on the display section 63 (S620). In particular, the user can recognize, by this warning display, that the wireless center 2a and the TV main unit 3 are not wirelessly connected with each other (specification at page 42, bottom paragraph). In other words, although a wireless connection is established between wireless center 2b and TV main unit, a warning is displayed to indicate that a wireless connection is not established between wireless center 2a and TV main unit 3. Thus, unlike the case in McDowall, the wireless terminal can establish a connection, although with the wrong wireless center. Subsequently, the wireless terminal of the claimed invention is capable of warning a user that a connection confirmation command has not been received within a predetermined time from the intended wireless center.

Applicant submits that McDowall's audio content provider Web site would not be arranged as two or more base devices receiving a broadcasting connection request command, where a connection is established for one base device, but a warning indicates that a connection is not established for another base device within a predetermined period. In other words, Applicant submits that McDowall teaches a condition where a connection cannot be established with a base device, but does not teach a condition where a connection cannot be established for an intended base device, while a connection is established with another base device.

Thus, Applicant submits that McDowall does not at least disclose a condition where a connection cannot be established for an intended base device while a connection is established with another base device.

With regard to dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 21, Applicant submits that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 11 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 21 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1 and 11. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all

presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: November 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs # 48222
Michael R. Cammarata Robert Downs
Registration No.: 39491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000